

REMARKS

The Office Action of February 13, 2005 has been carefully considered. In response thereto, the claims have been amended as set forth above. Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7, 10-13 and 15-19 were rejected as being anticipated by Mitchell. The claims have been amended to more clearly distinguish over the cited reference. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In particular, the claims have been amended to make clear that *an* activity detector is configured to detect an initiation of a data-transfer operation on a common bus and to provide therefrom *an* enabling signal that is communicated to bus interfaces of a plurality of components coupled to the common bus through respective bus interfaces. Furthermore, the claims have been amended to make clear that such enabling allows a bus interface of a component to receive data of a data transfer operation so detected. That is, there is neither loss of data nor the need for the repetition of data. Rather, low-latency operation allows a data operation to be detected by the activity detector and data of the same operation to be received by a component in response to an enabling signal from the activity detector.

Mitchell is not believed to teach or suggest such a feature.

Withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Ure, Reg. 33,089

Dated: August 13, 2006